REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in the application, with Claims 1, 15, 17 and 24 being the independent claims. Claims 17-28 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 14 and 28 are amended herein to improve their form without narrowing their scope. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by the amendments herein.

Response to Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has imposed a Restriction Requirement between:

Group I - Claims 1-16, drawn to a recording medium and a substrate; and

Group II - Claims 17-28, drawn to a method of making a recording medium.

Applicants affirm their previous, provisional election of Group I (Claims 1-16), with traverse.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims could be searched by one Examiner without undue effort. It is also respectfully submitted that it is not mandatory to make a restriction requirement in every possible situation.

It is believed that if one Examiner acts on all of the claims of the present application at one time, overall examining time will be less than if two or more Examiners are involved. It is also earnestly believed that the examination of all of the claims at one time by one

examiner in the present application will best ensure uniform prosecution quality. Therefore, in the interest of prosecution economy of time and quality for both the Office and Applicants, it is respectfully submitted that withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement in this application and examination of all pending claims on their merits are appropriate and such action is respectfully solicited.

Submission of Substitute Specification:

The Examiner has suggested that the specification be amended to make it more understandable. The Examiner has also pointed out the length requirement for a proper Abstract of the Disclosure. Therefore, Applicants submit herewith a substitute specification. The substitute specification (clean copy) incorporates changes to the specification and abstract of the disclosure to correct minor informalities in the specification and abstract that were originally filed in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. A marked-up copy of the original specification (with abstract), showing the matter added and deleted in the substitute specification, is also submitted herewith. The substitute specification and marked-up copy do not include the claims, in accordance with U.S. practice. It is submitted that the substitute specification includes no new matter.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The Examiner inquired about the term "ink receiving portion." This term means a portion (indicated as "H" in Fig. 1) that includes the ink receiving layer as well as the layer(s) beneath the ink receiving layer. It is further noted that at page 15, line 13 of the original specification, "ink receiving layer" is corrected to read --ink receiving portion--.

The Examiner also inquired about the term "increasing region." This term is explained at page 10, line 25 to page 12, line 11 and at page 15, lines 4-12 of the original specification. The "increasing region" is a region (indicated as "A" in Fig. 1) in which the amount of the reactive substance increases with an increase in distance (depth) from the surface (to the right, as shown in Fig. 1).

The Examiner also inquired about the phrase "in a position separate from an ink recording surface of said recording medium for ink." This phrase has been amended to read "in a position apart from an outermost ink recording surface of said recording medium for ink."

The Examiner also inquired about the phrase "said increasing region does not include said interface between the two different layers." It is submitted that this phrase is explained at page 14, line 11 to page 15, line 13 of the original specification, and that the clarification of the term "increasing region" above also provides clarification of this phrase.

In the first full paragraph of page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner inquires about the "anionic substance." Applicants note that the function of the anionic substance in the recording medium of the invention is indicated at page 14, line 11 to page 15, line 13 of the original specification. A surface of the undercoat layer is provided with anions (anionic substance). (See page 14, line 27.) Preferable anionic substances are boric acid and borate salts (page 30, lines 13-14 of the original specification) to be applied on the undercoat layer in the

surface treatment step. Further explanatory description of the anionic substance may be found starting at page 32, line 16 of the original specification: the anionic substance also functions as a crosslinking agent for the binder.

In the second full paragraph of page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner inquires about there being two separate applications of cross-linking agents. Applicants note that two separate applications of crosslinking agents are performed for the purpose of promoting interfacial diffusion of cationic components on the substrate to the undercoat layer, thereby forming the distribution of the cation.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner raises various issues regarding terminology used in Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 14. In view of the explanations noted above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection, and in view of the amendments herein to Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 14, it is submitted that these claims are not indefinite.

Moreover, regarding Claim 3, Applicants note that the decreasing region ("B" and "C" in Fig. 1) recited in Claim 3 lies at a position deeper from the outermost surface than the position of the increasing region ("A" in Fig. 1), which lies at a position of a certain depth from the outermost surface. Further explanation can be found at page 14, line 11 to page 15, line 13 of the original specification.

Regarding Claim 7, it is noted that the ink-receiving layer is recited in line 2, thus providing antecedent basis for "said ink receiving layer."

Applicants submit that the amended specification and claims comply with all aspects of Section 112, and that all Section 112 rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants further submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the above-noted objections and rejections, rejoinder of withdrawn Claims 17-28, and issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Jean K. Dudek
Registration No. 30,938

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
JKD:ayr
166309 v 1